

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 32, 34-36 and 38, allowed claims 21-27, 29-31, 39-44 and 46-49 and objected to claims 33 and 37, but indicated claims 33 and 37 as allowable in independent format. Applicants thank Examiner Gutman for the indication of allowable subject matter. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have amended claim 21 and added new claim 50. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

I. Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings for failing to show the mechanical fastener or adhesive of claim 21. Applicants submit herewith a replacement page of drawings with the fastener indicated with 21 as its numerical designation.

II. Rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103

Although claims of the present application were rejected under 35 USC 102 and 103, Applicants have amended the claims of the present application such that only allowed subject matter or subject matter indicated as allowable remains pending. In particular, Claim 32 has been amended to include the language of dependent claim 37, which was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent format. Moreover, new claim 50 is the same as independent claim 32 amended to include the language of dependent claim 33, which was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent format.

In view of the above, Applicants request a Notice of Allowance for the claims of the present application.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather, Applicants intend to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient

showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the lack of teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4 May, 2006



Scott Chapple
Registration No. 46,287
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215